Mr Chatterton

Weymouth October 1st 1859

111

Dear Mr. Mc Kim,

Do you suppose a Sanguine temperament can express itself on blue paper? — I doubt: but it is all I can lay my hand on at the moment.

You took a vast risk in showing my letter to Oliver — that I am sure of, tho' I do not remember any thing but the fact that it was well meant & true to my own sense of the demands of the case. But nothing can be more unwise & decisive than the maxim of speaking to our friends exactly as we do of them & vice versâ. We gradually lose all our freedom, & consequently all our power, by always striving to step in our own tracks (as it were) in this way. In speaking to a friend, we naturally & instinctively bring our faculties to meet his in such a way as communicate & commune. While in speaking of him we are thinking less of his personality & our own adaptation to it, than of critically examining how he fits to the rest of the world. There con-

Indications are the reasons why
private letters should not be shown.
The inability of most persons to re-
member in their own case, that
what was said of them was but
a very small proportion of what
was felt & thought & desired about
them, is the cause of the mischief that
grows out of the showing of private
correspondence; & the want of
care about it is the reason why
we in America are as a general
rule, in so suffering a condition, as to
want of what the French call
Epanchement & the English,
effusion. But to show you that
I am willing to rely on your judge-
ment in this particular matter,
& to believe that no harm will be
done by your showing Olmsted a letter
written for yourself alone, I go on,
to finish with one or two more
reflections germane to the matter
which will complete my doubts wheth-
er we are likely to raise any salaries
now, & exhibit my notion of the
duty devolving on the guardians
from what in a general way

proportions for increase of expenditure comes.

I need not confine myself to this that or the other particular case, but take a fresh one by which I can at once express what is in my own mind, reply to your last letter & illustrate this particular case at the same time. I agree with you about the Standard. If it had 20.000 Subscribers it ought to pay the Editor £2000 per annum perhaps. If ought to be made a great paper, & £10.000 expenditure now would probably do it. It ought, (the Am Soc.) to gather round it now all the talent, genius & ability of the rising generation. Pick Sumner to lead, the rising generation, (the real influential portion — the live Yes,) will follow, & This must be the organ of "Young America" — in the high & good sense of those words. If the Standard were fully equal to the cause, — that is to say the great paper of the Accident — confessedly, may indemnifiably so, by reason of the wealth of genius & ability poured into it, — it would be the organ of the

van-guard of the land. But you see just what money can do & what it cannot do, by the Tribune, Post & Independent. We must awaken a Spirit in the whole body of the youth of the land, that shall make it

"Stand beside us like our youth.

[Wallenstein.]

Now we both very well know that we did not take hold of the cause because we were "worthy of our hire." And we do not fulfill our duty as Custodians of the honour of the cause as well as of its funds, (as you so well say,) unless we awaken in others this same Spirit that has animated ourselves. I have heard it sometimes said among our abolitionists — "the yeas have not the pay of grocers' boys." very true: — neither is their career that of a grocer's boy. There is a difference between Sanding the Sugar & Swaying the Sceptre of the Millenial year; — & what we need & what duty we ought to ask for is merely enough to enable us to Sway it. be it much or little. If we could have generalship, Literary

ability, Moral & pecuniary
& entirely unconnected from self & qualifications in addition to the profoundest love & devotedness to the cause, for just enough to keep soul & body together (as the saying is) it seems to me it would be our highest honour, to be of power employed upon our Land, to procure it upon those terms: while it may still be our highest Wisdom to pray one more for Good, provided it answered the purpose so to do. Such a case might arise, — though in a general sense, the sinews of that value will be given; for the pride & joy of serving them, though no one knows of the gift. But supposing either of us to become aware of the importance of some sum to the cause, whose involvements & engagements were such that he could not take service under it, but at a cost to us of Good. Of course I should be zealous to secure whatever I really thought indispensable; but whenever proposed it should be aware that to him or her the Society would look for the means of doing so, when

by No vote & gave the required moral support to the proposition.

I really do, on my conscience, believe, that $10:00 now spent on the Standard, would be returned cent per cent in money in half a dozen years. Suppose I propose such an appropriation? I can procure the vote in Meeting of the Assn. for the moment I can convince the Society that am able & willing to raise the money. But as to expecting the 200 most devoted members to procure 25 subscribers each year, — the least that one could propose — & which would do this thing at once — Why they would rather buy or make some unjust article, & maintain the paper in a depressing way for only 1500 subscribers. Many Friends common sense tells them this is a poor business calculation who might take hold with push

energy & zeal accordingly to see fifteen thousand Labourers set in Spite of them. But the efforts to better the paper & to spread it — to raise & to spend the Money should be Simultaneous. How can we raise this Money by Co operation? I have sometimes had it in my mind to say "I will only raise Money this year on condition of its being to expended." But the times have not seemed fully ripe. Neither do I feel as if the Spirit of dictation in expenditure were the one that secures unity of effort. I have only felt it right for me hitherto to say — "the Standard — the Am. Soc." Upon to the point we labour towards," without specifying any ways of expenditure. But soon

as the time

I think, to speedy "extension
of circulation by the fairest
means with which we should
carry on a business, individually
for the promotion of our own
interests, so we alone propose to
promote the interests of this
Paper & thus Loyalty: I only
trust to do it we shall secure
our own interests & prospects — but
this we cant say so publickly — we
can only let the fact appear —
& blindly foolish as the world is,
it does see that as the cause
increases we decrease, in every
way. & sometimes they are foolish
& blind enough to say "See how the
Lord is against you! You are in
Poverty, age, dishes, — & all becaus
you are abolitionists!" Just like
people say to.

Well — we must combine the
Spirit of trade & the Spirit of
Chivalry, — we must be at once
Philosophers & fanatics, yet a little long
N. B. Do your Fair Committee desire

increase of salary to any agent? Let them take out & above to the treasury, loaded with that Imputation!

Have you ever been aware in writing, no matter on what subject & to what purpose or with what weakness or force, that what we ourselves write We cannot remember? I do not recollect the particulars of what I have written to Emma Watson. If it is worth sending to you. If I should read it over, I should be almost sure not to send it. So often does it happen to me to write & to keep back the letter. So I decline to read it over — consequently it comes to you clean & unintentional as in seeing the Eye sees not itself, so in writing, the thought is ourselves — our act of living, at the moment, & we do not take Cognisance of it by memory. This is what illiterate people mistake for being dictated to by Spirits, as they say. It is only themselves, when a second [illegible]

being touchy.

Yes — I remember your forcible expletive. I did not take exception at it myself, & shall not make an ill use of it even if you had not so to say taken it back. Emerson lectured last winter on Euphuisms, & elegant weaknesses of expression, & the value of commonness in style & expression, rather giving his sanction to cursing & swearing. It was to the same audience, among 3000 others, who cheered this in Emerson, that Wendell Speaking of Massachusetts under Sumnerism & not being able to prohibit vendition said — "this damn Massachusetts!" It

did not annoy me but
then it did not surprise
the professors of harsh language
who do not know his reason
for saying so, & will always make
his saying so a defence & a reason
sins, for their own bad taste & bad
temper, & will call Dr
Phenon "an accused Serpent"
& plead Wendell Phillips' ex-
ample.

Im haste

Yours truly

J. W. Chapman

Many thanks for your
kind invitation to the Pan
Am. Meet. How glad
I should be to come! And I

am overcome with
work — more to be done
than I can accomplish &
I leave it for an instant